

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,473	08/03/2001		Alex Urich	CTREE-72853(155696033-P01	7208
24201	7590	06/16/2006		EXAMI	NER
FULWIDI		=	BOUCHELLE, LAURA A		
6060 CENT 10TH FLO		E	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGI	ELES, CA	90045	3763		
				DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/922,473	URICH, ALEX				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Laura A. Bouchelle	3763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a replicate will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this communication. INDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20	<u>) March 2006</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ T	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
·	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1,3-5,16,18-22,24 and 25</u> is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1,3-5,16,18-22,24 and 25</u> is/are rej 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	frawn from consideration.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a  Applicant may not request that any objection to to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cortain the cor	accepted or b) objected to be the drawing(s) be held in abeyand rection is required if the drawing(s	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 16, 18, 19 20, 21, 22, 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Easley (US 6599271) in view of Maaskamp (US 6149663) in further view of Ureche et al (US5167620). Easley discloses a device for preventing post occlusion flow surges during eye surgery comprising a tube, a filter housing coupled to the tube, a flow restrictor, and a filter (Abstract). Easley fails to explicitly disclose a flow restrictor with a diameter between 0.1 and 1.0 millimeter. Maaskamp teaches a flow control system for endoscopic surgeries comprising a flow restrictor attached by a luer coupling having a fixed internal diameter of about 1.5 mm or narrower or wider depending on the requirements of the device to maintain constant pressure in the system (Col. 4, lines 30-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Easley to be of the size specified by Maaskamp so that it can maintain optimum pressure characteristics.

Art Unit: 3763

3. Claims 1, 5, 16, 20 further differ from the teachings of Easley in view of Maaskamp in

calling for the tube to have an inner diameter of between 1.5 and 2.5 mm. Ureche teaches an eye

surgery device having a supply and aspiration lines that have an inside diameter of about 2 mm

to provide optimal delivery and aspiration characteristics for eye surgery. Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device

of Easley in view of Maaskamp to have tubes with internal diameters of about 2 mm as taught by

Ureche to provide optimal delivery and aspiration characteristics for eye surgery.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see page 5, filed 3/20/06, with respect to the rejection(s) of

claim(s) 1, 5, 16, 20, 22 under Saaski and Easely in view of Saaski have been fully considered

and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further

consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Easley in view of Maaskamp in

further view of Ureche.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Laura A. Bouchelle whose telephone number is 571-272-2125.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4.

Application/Control Number: 09/922,473 Page 4

Art Unit: 3763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 517-272-4977. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laura A Bouchelle

Examiner Art Unit 3763

LAB

NICHOLAS D. LUCCITEI

SUPERVISORY PATERY EVA

TECHNOLOGY CELL TA SVED